Appl. No. 09/ 249,463

Amdt. Dated October 6, 2004

Response to Office Action mailed April 6, 2004

REMARKS

Applicant has modified the claims to further specify that the mixed signal specified is

comprised of signal charges that are originally generated by pixels of a common row that are

separated by at least one intervening pixel whose signal charge is not included in the mixed

signal. Applicant submits that the art of record provides no teaching or suggestion of this

advance in the art. Applicant has also added new claims that specifies the operation

described in Figures 14 and 15 where mixed signal charges from a first row are separated by

charges from a second row. Ishigami merely describes mixing pixels from separate rows.

There is simply no teaching or suggestion in the prior art of Applicants claimed signal

processing wherein signal charges from separated pixels of a common row are mixed

together.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the prior art rejections in light of

the claim modifications.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/6/04

Robert J. Depke

HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLC

131 S. Dearborn, 30th Floor

Chicago, Illinois 60603

Tel: (312) 263-3600

Attorney for Applicant

6

Appl. No. 09/ 249,463 Amdt. Dated October 6, 2004 Response to Office Action mailed April 6, 2004



CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this co	rrespondence is being	g deposited with the United States
Postal Service as First Class Mail on	10/6/04	in an envelope addressed
to:		

Mail Stop Fee Amendment Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Attorney for Applicants